

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF MÖRCH'S 1852-1853 CATALOGUE

(see volume 19, pages 254-256)

By Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*)

In order to make sure for myself both as a malacologist and as a Commissioner I have studied very carefully the proposal of Mr. Soot-Ryen to validate the Yoldi catalogue published by O. A. L. Mörch in 1852-1853. It is admittedly a pure sales catalogue and does not fit as a scientific paper for publication of new names. As indicated by Mr. Soot-Ryen, there are a number of generic names now in general use, as exemplified in the number quoted as valid by Thiele (*Handb. Moll. Kunde* 1, 1931 and 2, 1935). Of the said names, 10 are full genera in Thiele's book (2 monotypic), 15 cover subgenera (3 monotypic), 18 for sections (3 monotypic), and 8 are recognized as available without being incorporated in the system used by Thiele. One name was not mentioned at all. Apparently, there is every reason to grant availability to these names, but it may be well to abstain for the moment from placing them on the Official List—except the name *Pseudamussium*, about which Mr. Soot-Ryen has worked out the necessary details.

By Myra Keen (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

I wish to support the petition by Dr. T. Soot-Ryen (Z.N.(S.) 1501) for recognition of the *Catalogus Conchyliorum* of Mörch, 1852-53, as a valid source of names and for the designation of a type-species for *Pseudamussium* as *Pecten septemradiatus* Müller, 1776. This is in harmony with most current usage and would serve as guidance for the treatment of other of Mörch's generic and specific names.

COMMENT ON THE NAME OF THE TYPE-SPECIES OF *XENOPHORA*.
Z.N.(S.) 1483By Myra Keen (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

It may now be too late to comment upon the petition of Dr. Katherine Palmer concerning Xenophoridae (Z.N.(S.) 1483). I am in sympathy with the purpose of the petition but am not convinced that the name *Turbo trochiformis* Born, 1778 should be regarded as the earliest valid name for the type-species of *Xenophora* and placed on the Official List. Not only, as pointed out by R. Robertson (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 19 : 231), is this specific name a *nomen oblitum* but one must either regard it as composite or as having as its only objective indication a figure of a *Calyptraea*, a genus in a wholly different family. Validation of the latter would jeopardize *Patella trochiformis* Gmelin, 1791, currently used (either as *Calyptraea* or as *Trochita trochiformis*) for a Peruvian species. Validation, by use of the plenary powers, of the specific epithet *trochiformis* for the *Xenophora* would displace the well-known and long-used *X. conchyliophorus* (Born, 1780). One can argue that Born himself recognized the composite nature of the 1778 proposal and in 1780, as first reviser, chose to bestow a new name on the *Xenophora*. At this date, however, it seems in the interest of stability to inter *Turbo trochiformis* permanently by placing it on the Official Index of Rejected specific names rather than to attempt to resurrect it.